

City Council Special and Regular Meetings, May 8, 2001

Twin Pines Senior and Community Center, 1223 Ralston Avenue

**SPECIAL MEETING: 6:30 P.M.**

**CLOSED SESSIONS**

A. Conference with Labor Negotiator, City Manager Kersnar, pursuant to Government Code Section No. 54957.6

1. MMCEA

2. AFSCME

3. BPOA

Attended by Council Members Cook, Warden (arrived at 6:40 p.m.), Wright, Rianda, Hahn, City Manager Kersnar, Human Resources Director Dolan, City Attorney Savaree, and Lee Finney, Industrial Employers and Distributors Association Representative. Deputy City Clerk Harrington was excused from attending.

Adjournment at this time being 7:15 P.M, this meeting was adjourned.

Meeting not tape recorded.

Sheila Harrington

Deputy City Clerk

**REGULAR MEETING - 7:36 P.M.**

**ROLL CALL**

COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT: Cook, Warden, Wright, Rianda, Hahn

COUNCILMEMBERS ABSENT: None

Staff Present: City Manager Kersnar, City Attorney Savaree, Community Development Director Ewing, Public Works Director Curtis, Finance Director Fil, Police Chief Janke, Human Resources Director Dolan, Principal Planner de Melo, Assistant City Engineer Jones, IT Manager Harnish, GIS Coordinator de Rouen, Deputy City Clerk Harrington

**REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

Mayor Hahn announced that direction was given, and no action taken.

**SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY/PRESENTATIONS**

## **Mayor's Proclamation declaring May 20, 2001 as San Juan Canyon Day in Belmont.**

Mayor Hahn read the proclamation aloud to the audience and thanked Mr. McLaughlin, the Poet Laureate of Belmont, for writing it.

## **Update on Pedestrian/Bike Bridge Project.**

Presentation by Assistant City Engineer Duncan Jones, Consultants Mark Ashley, Project Manager/Bridge Engineer of T.Y. Lin International, and Ricardo Rabines Bridge Architect of Safdie Rabines Architects.

Engineer Jones outlined the history of the project. Since the initial meeting with Council, 11 public meetings have been held as well as a Planning Commission and Park and Recreation Commission meetings. The original project alignment has been changed, due to an adverse reaction by the neighbors. The School District Board no longer favors the bikepath from the apartment complex on Old County Road through Nesbit School, since this would create another point of access at the back of the schoolyard. Issues raised at the public meetings included: control of access for security, loss of parking and safer intersections.

Engineer Jones outlined alternative routes that were being considered. The Park and Recreation Commission suggested the bridge come down on the north side of the slough and enter directly into the bike trail that goes around the north side practice fields. This would be a direct connection to the Bay Trail.

As a result of this project, the Safe Routes to School would create a school zone in the vicinity of the three intersections in front of Nesbit Elementary School. Traffic calming devices could include intersection neckdowns or traffic circles, an engineering study would determine which was best. This would go up Hiller, Masonic, and Old County Road. This would cut down cross traffic on Hiller.

Consultant Mark Ashley discussed the community outreach aspect of this project. They wanted the bridge to bear the signature of the community. He noted that one more conceptual design review workshop would be held. At the meetings they discussed the image they wanted to project and what they thought the essence of Belmont was.

Three alternatives and visions statements were developed out of the meetings:

- A. The essence of Belmont is tying historical to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century; the bridge is a suspension, asymmetrical bridge, and a landmark structure for the city.
- B. The essence of Belmont is home, trees, hills, country and privacy; the bridge is a flowing, inviting bridge, not a landmark structure, more conventional.
- C. The essence of Belmont can best be described as diverse architecture and the bridge is a conventional bridge and still a landmark that would compliment the train station.

**Mr. Rabines** Bridge Architect showed the bridge designs that were created based on the vision statements.

Consultant Mark Ashley had the workshop participants rate the designs, there was clear consensus for Alternative B, Alternative A was the least desirable.

The Planning Commission was divided between Alternatives A and B; there was no clear consensus. The Planning Commission was concerned that there was not enough community input.

The Park and Recreation Commission selected Alternative B unanimously, with the provision that the landing zone on the sports complex side be studied for alternatives.

Engineer Jones stated he would place survey forms at the library, city hall, and city website for more public input.

C. Cook, suggested placing survey forms at the Farmers' Market, and including the vision statements for each alternative.

In response to C. Warden, Engineer Jones stated that Alternative B would cost \$2.5 million, Alternative C \$3 million, and Alternative A would cost \$3.5 to \$4 million.

C. Rianda mentioned a bridge in Santa Clara County that had trees across it and a bridge in Millbrae with good architecture and victorian lighting. She would like to incorporate those aspects into the design. C. Rianda recommended the Arts Commission review the bridge designs.

In response to C. Wright, Engineer Jones stated the schedule would be extended by one month. He would return to Council for final direction on one concept and give the consultant additional time to prepare final drawings.

C. Wright was concerned that they might get a hodge podge design with more input.

C. Hahn was concerned about the maintenance cost for Alternative A, liked Alternative B and agreed with C. Rianda that natural enhancements would be fitting.

Engineer Jones stated they were applying for Bicycle Transportation Account funding at the end of May, for the remaining, \$785,000 to close the gap to \$2.5 million. There were other grants available that they could apply for, up to \$2 million.

### **PUBLIC/COUNCIL COMMENTS**

**Mr. Gibson**, 3114 E. Laurel Creek invited the public to San Juan Canyon Day on May 20 at 2p.m. in Ralston Village and distributed information to the Council.

C. Cook announced that the Belmont Farmers' Market would reopen on May 20, and this year the market will be held every Sunday in the Caltrain parking lot.

C. Hahn announced that on May 19<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m. would be the rededication of Alexander Park.

### **AGENDA AMENDMENTS**

Council agreed unanimously to add a Proclamation to the agenda declaring May 20, 2001 as San Juan Canyon Day. Item 6-B City Hall/Police Facility would be adopted by a Resolution.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Approval of meeting minutes:** Special and Regular Meetings April 10, 2001.

**Approval** of Warrant List Dated: April 20, 2001 in total amount of \$427,650.21 and dated April 27, 2001 in total amount of \$36,552.84.

**Written Communication** 1). Rec. 4/24 from PG&E notice of public participation hearings on rate design (Applic. 00-11-056); 2). Rec. 4/25 from PG&E re. General Rate Case 2002.

**Motion** to approve Claims Management Report. (none)

**Motion** to waive reading of Ordinances.

**Resolution No. 8980** approving plans and authorization to advertise for sealed bids for the Water Dog Lake Dam Spillway Repair, CCN 416.

**Motion** to set Public Hearing for June 12, 2001, to consider adoption of NPDES City- Wide charges.

**Motion** to set Public Hearing for June 12, 2001 to consider adoption of annual sewer charges.

**Resolution No. 8981** regarding the City of Belmont's Intention to Issue Tax-Exempt Special Tax Bonds. (Reimbursement of qualifying library expenditures from proceeds of future library bond)

**Resolution No. 8982** approving the purchase of one Zieman trailer for the Parks and Recreation Department from Turf & Industrial Equipment for an amount not to exceed \$6,081.48.

**Resolution No. 8983** approving the purchase of Internet Mapping Software (ArcIMS) as part of the Geographic Information System Implementation Plan.

**Resolution No. 8984** approving the First Amendment to the Master Lease with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board. (Belmont Farmers' Market)

**Resolution No. 8985** authorizing a sublease with the Pacific Coast Farmers' Market Association.

Consent Calendar adopted as amended. Moved by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and approved unanimously by show of hands.

## **PUBLIC/HEARINGS**

**Public Hearing** to consider an appeal filed on March 30, 2001, by Mr. Herring, regarding Planning Commission Action taken on March 20, 2001, recommending City Council disapproval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Tentative Parcel Map and Single Family Design Review application to subdivide a one-acre parcel into two lots and construction of a new single family residence on one of the two lots, for property located at 1601 Courtland Road, Lot A, Block 33, Montebello Subdivision, Assessor's Parcel No. 045-212-010.

Principal Planner de Melo, stated the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend disapproval of this project. The one acre site currently contains a single family dwelling, if the tentative parcel map were approved the existing dwelling would be sited on the larger of the two lots which would be .69 acres. The applicant proposed locating a new 3,498 s.f. single family dwelling on .31 acres.

**Mr. Fred Herring**, Project Architect, stated they worked on this project for 2 1/2 years. The City assigned 4 to 5 different project planners during the process. He acknowledged this was an

exceedingly steep site with a dreadful past. They conducted many tests to satisfy the town geologist including drilling a 30-inch hole. Mr. Herring stated the General Plan issue was not raised until they went to the Planning Commission, and felt they should have been notified sooner.

Mr. Herring noted that he sent a letter to the neighbors in response to a petition with approximately 100 signatures against the project. He only received one response back regarding safeguards during the construction. He stated that expert testimony confirmed that the site was feasible, and it could increase the stability. The house was sited on the steepest part of the lot by design. Mr. Herring stated the City planners and geologist recommended approval for this project to the Planning Commission.

Mayor Hahn opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Carlomagno, 1615 Vine Street stated he was concerned about a nine-foot wall on Vine Street. Debris would flow between the two homes when it rained. He requested Council uphold the Planning Commission decision.

Mr. Richy, 1609 Vine Street stated the slope was steep, and was concerned about the nine-foot wall. Mr. Richy did not think the wall would blend with the neighborhood design.

Ms. Thompson, 38 Vine Street asked Council to uphold the Planning Commission decision. The property has at least a 62% slope, over twice the allowable limit. Sliding and drainage issues would not be stabilized by building this home. She stated this home would jeopardize the surrounding properties.

Mr. Sorensen, 1610 Courtland Road opposed the building of this house. He stated that in wet winters, the hillside along Vine and Courtland runs off into the street down the drains. A house built on the hill supported by pillars could slide into the street, if the ground was saturated with water.

Mr. Herring, responded that every geotechnical issue was raised by Cotton and Associates. The issues were studied and the problems were resolved by the design. The wall would not be seen below the house, the only wall would be a debris flow wall and it would be heavily landscaped.

On motion by C. Rianda, seconded by C. Wright, and approved unanimously by show of hands, to close the Public Hearing.

In response to C. Rianda's question, Mr. Herring stated that he has built 100's of homes and was aware that General Plans exist, but did not review it in this case.

C. Warden confirmed with Community Development Director Ewing that the General Plan was a reference document when making a finding for a subdivision. C. Warden cited relevant sections from the General Plan.

C. Rianda noted that the geological input stated that there was visible slough and subterranean movement beyond the surface slough. Some of the recommendations made were based on limited field exploration, and were subject to confirmation of actual conditions encountered during construction. C. Rianda stated there was no guarantee that the mitigation's proposed would work.

C. Cook, stated that they needed to avoid developments where the slope was over 30%. She thought the majority of this lot was not developable and should remain that way. Considerable time had been spent on landslide issues in that area of Belmont.

C. Wright, stated he did not see any new information, in the process, that would cause him to overturn the Planning Commission decision.

C. Hahn stated she would uphold the Planning Commission decision.

**Action:** On motion by C. Cook, seconded by C. Rianda and approved unanimously by show of hands to adopt:

**Resolution No. 8986** upholding the Planning Commission decision and disapproving a mitigated negative declaration and tentative parcel map and single family design review application at 1601 Courtland Road (Appl. No. 1007)

Recess at this time being 8:45 P.M.

Meeting Resumed at this time being 8:51 P.M.

**Public Hearing to consider a Conceptual Development Plan, General Plan Amendment, and Zone Change to construct 48 townhouses on a five-acre site currently occupied by the Peninsula Jewish Community Center (PJCC) at 2440 Carlmont Drive. On-site parking would be provided for 120 vehicles for the units. The project would include 2.6 acres of landscape area, which includes hillside and riparian area to the north and west of the units. (Application No. 00-1005); APN: 045-031-010; Zoned: R-3 (Multi-Family Residential - Garden Apartments); CEQA Status: Mitigated Negative Declaration; Summerhill Homes (Applicant); Peninsula Jewish Community Center (Owner)**

Principal Planner de Melo, stated the Planning Commission voted 5/2 recommending approval of this project. The project would consist of a 48 unit residential townhouse development on a 5 acre site. The plan included 12 4-plex buildings, 4 different floorplans were proposed which consisted of 36 2-bedroom, and 12 3-bedroom units, a pool, spa complex and tot lot area. Access to the development was proposed from a two way driveway entrance fronting on Carlmont Drive at the Southeast corner of the project site. A loop road would access the units. They proposed 120 parking spaces consisting of 96 garage spaces, (2 spaces per unit) and 24 uncovered spaces for guest parking. 2.6 acres of open space would remain in the development, with a trail created between the project entrance at Carlmont Drive and Old Lake Road to provide access to Water Dog Lake Park.

Council discussed the trails on the property.

C. Warden questioned why this project did not require an Environmental Impact Report.

Community Development Director Ewing stated the potential impacts could be resolved by straightforward mitigation measures and a Negative Declaration could be used. If they believed that additional studies need to be completed to determine the extent of the impacts then an EIR would be prepared. He did not believe that was necessary in this case, the differences between the current use and the proposed use were in many cases quite small and determined a Negative Declaration was appropriate.

**Craig Champion**, Summerhill Homes, stated the initial proposal was submitted in January, 2000, which consisted of 60 units and was considered too dense. The project was presented to the Planning Commission in September 2000, with 52 units. Summerhill further addressed the concerns of the Planning Commission and reduced the project to 48 units.

**Karl Lagonie, Bassenian and Lagoni**, Project Architect, highlighted the issues faced on the land plan. The applicant was proposing four buildings designed so the width of the front of the unit was narrower than the rear, this would reduce the scale and the mass that fronts the street. The project was designed with visual corridors, to take advantage of riparian areas and open space. Two types of product, flat padded on the first and third tiers, and upslope for the second and fourth tier, were designed to disturb less natural terrain.

**Craig Champion**, Summerhill Homes, compared their project density with the existing buildings that surround the site. The general ranges were 40 units an acre, this project was at 9.6 units per acre. They increased the playground area near the cabana and deleted the detached garages. They increased the setback on Carlmont Drive to a 25 foot setback. He stated they would comply with the Planning Commission condition of a Detailed Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Over 50% of the site would be in open space or landscaped. They would pay the Park Dedication Fee of \$700,000 and the Pool Impact Fee of \$300,000. They would expand the drainage outflow from 48 inches to 72 inches, which would reduce the potential for flood in the area. Mr. Champion estimated a 77% reduction of daily traffic on Carlmont Drive. The PJCC currently has 1,000 members, 300 of those members were from Belmont. Mr. Champion requested approval of the application.

Mayor Hahn opened the Public Hearing.

**Mr. Bauer**, 1027 Tahoe Drive, stated his children went to the PJCC. Mr. Bauer reviewed the project plans and thought it was an enhancement to the neighborhood. He encouraged Council to endorse this project and thought it would benefit the City.

**Mr. Gersch**, President, Board of Directors PJCC, stated the existing 20,000 s.f. center was 40 years old. The PJCC acquired a 12 acre site in Foster City and would build a new 140,000 s.f. center. The Belmont site would close at the end of the school year 2002. Mr. Gersh urged Council to approve the project.

**Ms. McNutt**, Read Avenue, PJCC Board Member for 9 years. The new center would have two pools and new amenities. She stated the Summerhill project would be an attractive addition to the community and hoped the \$1 million dollars in fees would be used to build a teen facility in Belmont. Ms. McNutt asked for support of the application.

**Mr. King**, 2441 Carlmont Drive, stated there was a density problem on Carlmont Drive and asked if this project would cause further problems. He stated the PJCC did not bother the residents because the use time was during off hours, in between commute hours. Mr. King thought that adding more residential units would impact the current residents.

On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Wright and agreed unanimously by a show of hands to close the Public Hearing.

C. Wright stated he liked the project, and thought it was the closest to moderately priced that Belmont would get. He stated he would have supported a higher density project. C. Wright thought the key issues had been mitigated and believed that traffic would be lowered. He stated the loss of the pool was the greatest concern expressed by the community.

In response to C. Hahn's question as to why the PJCC chose Summerhill, Mr. Gersch stated he had a meeting in the City offices, with the then City Manager. Summerhill and one other developer were posed as the two that the City would most like to see as the developer of the project. The PJCC went forward with the transaction with Summerhill based upon that guidance.

Mr. Gersch stated the PJCC needed approximately \$40 million to build the Foster Site and they were 70% through the fundraising process. Construction would start in the next two months.

C. Cook, stated that she agreed with C. Wright that this was a quality project. The community needed housing stock and liked that the public would be able to access Water Dog Lake. C. Cook stated that she supported the project.

C. Warden, stated he needed to make a finding to amend the General Plan. There was no entitlement for that. He read goals and policies from the General Plan and stated it was a difficult decision to change the zoning.

C. Rianda stated that these homes would cost between \$500,000 and \$600,000. Based on the 30% average for income it would require an income of between \$150,000 and \$180,000 to purchase a home. ABAG statistics stated that Belmont needed rental homes. ABAG statistics state that in the salary range of \$122,000 and 184,000 countywide we will be 1,100 units over what was needed. ABAG projected a deficiency in rental units for all salary ranges, except for the \$122,000 to the \$184,000. C. Rianda stated that Belmont had enough ownership units and need rental units.

C. Rianda stated that she would like to reduce the density. The current zoning of R-3 would allow a maximum of 84. That would be 16.7 units per acre. There were 2.4 acres to be developed, with the same density that would work out to be 40.08 units. The 48 units on the 2.4 acres was still too high. C. Rianda would like to stay consistent with the original R-3 zoning. There was 5 acres, but they chose to do compact housing on 2.4 acres, if they developed all 5 acres then you come out with 16.7 units per acre, and 2.7 acres comes out to 40 units.

C. Rianda stated she was concerned that there was no proposal for low to moderate units or below market units. She noted that there was only one entrance to the project and thought that lower density would allow another entrance. C. Rianda would like the tot lot to be open to the public.

C. Rianda stated that she did not think she could make the findings presented in the staff report.

C. Rianda thought the onsite parking was deficient and the current parking lot at the JCC was used for neighborhood overflow parking at night. C. Rianda pointed out that the developer fees did not keep up with the additional expenditures that the School District experiences.

C. Rianda stated that she hoped Summerhill would incorporate the comments and present Council with alternatives at a later date.

C. Hahn stated that there was no sharing with Council that several builders had been discussed with staff, there was no knowledge that there was any discussion entered into or opinions given relative to future direction for the community center. She had a trepidation about making a General Plan amendment. C. Hahn thought the project was too dense. She noted the Hidden Valley development donated a significant amount of open space to the City for perpetuity. C. Hahn would prefer to see something that fit into the hillside better.



In response to C. Cook's question, Mr. Gersch stated that the PJCC explored other options and was surprised that Council was surprised about the meetings that took place with the City Manager at the time. The PJCC ultimately went in the direction based on the guidance from the City Manager's office that this was the type of project that the City wanted in Belmont. Mr. Gersch thought this was the type of project that had the highest likelihood of being accepted. The amendment to the general plan had been discussed at that time. Mr. Gersch stated he left that meeting feeling that that was not a difficult thing to do and was compatible with the use that was going on. Mr. Gersch further stated that they need to maximize the value that they can get for the land, every qualified institutionalized use that they were approached with would not have yielded enough funds to be able to sell it.

C. Wright, stated that he thought that C. Rianda contradicted herself. The contradiction was that what we really need is affordable rental housing, but we want lower density. Those two things were incompatible. C. Wright stated that he supports open space in the community, but wanted to make clear who had to pay for that open space. He did not think it was fair to the PJCC to go back through the process

C. Rianda, stated that if they had to have increased density, then she wanted housing that the City was deficient in, and that was rental units.

C. Cook stated that Summerhill discussed the concept of the project with the Council a year ago, and thought it was unfair that they gave general consensus and direction where this project was going. Lots of time had been spent on this project.

C. Hahn clarified that their comments were restricted in the parallel process, and there was not a formal application before them at that time.

**Action:** C. Rianda moved to continue the project and provide guidance to the applicant and staff for further development of the conceptual development plan and mitigated negative declaration and general plan.

Community Development Director Ewing, requested City Council consensus on the action to be taken.

In response to C. Hahn's question, City Attorney Savaree, stated that Council could have a general discussion to come to a consensus. She stated that if the motion to continue is still pending and if there is a second, then the maker of the motion could indicate as part of that motion the aspects of the project that the council would like to see be further looked at.

**Action:** C. Warden, stated he would second the motion but was concerned about traffic flow and how it related to am/pm peak. He stated that it was addressed in the traffic study, but thought that it had a negative impact in terms of residential use of that site. He also suggested getting feedback from the people who live in the area.

City Attorney Savaree clarified that if this was continued, C. Warden was requesting that C. Rianda amend the motion so that traffic issues would be additionally studied.

C. Warden, stated the traffic issue and neighborhood outreach.

**Action:** C. Rianda, agreed to the amendment and outlined the issues she wanted addressed: density, traffic circulation, the one entrance versus two entrances, the number of parking spaces

to deal with 108 bedrooms, If the density remained the same then she would like consideration of rental units. The parking, the fact that the parking lot is used for overflow parking at night. C. Rianda stated that if the kind of housing Summerhill was proposing, remained the same, then she would like to see the density reduced to 40, which would be consistent with the density that it was zoned for currently. C. Rianda stated she would consider higher density for rental units.

C. Cook, stated she would vote to go along with the consensus of the Council, but she was concerned about giving direction to the developer to make changes if there was not support to change the zoning.

Community Development Director Ewing, stated that the developer was going to need some time, and staff would renote when the time was right to come back to Council.

C. Wright, stated that he supported the project as it stood, but was willing to continue if they went in a workable direction. C. Wright wondered what the process was that Council could give the developer more specificity, to bring back something novel, that would get three votes.

C. Hahn called for the vote.

**Action:** Council voted unanimously, 5/0 by a show of hands, to continue this item.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Resolution upholding the Planning Commission's decision to deny a Floor Area Ratio exception & Single Family Design Review at 3817 Naughton Avenue. (Shehabi)**

Principal Planner de Melo, presented a survey of the surrounding properties which indicated that the subject dwelling with the proposed additions would result in the highest floor area ratio (FAR) of the surveyed properties. This FAR would be inconsistent with the FAR of the surrounding neighborhood which is identically zoned HRO-2, and would be a grant of special privilege.

**Action:** On motion by C. Warden, seconded by C. Rianda and approved by show of hands, 3-2 ( C. Cook and C. Wright abstained), to adopt:

**Resolution No. 8987** upholding the Planning Commission decision to deny a Floor Area Ratio Exception and Single Family Design Review at 3817 Naughton Avenue (Application No. 00-1065).

### **Status Report on the City Hall/Police Facility Project.**

Public Works Director Curtis stated the architect was not ready with plans and suggested canceling the bid date and re-advertise when the plans were ready, possibly in July.

C. Rianda stated she thought this was unprofessional and irresponsible of the project architect.

Council concurred to have the project architect at the next City Council meeting for a special presentation.

## **MEETING EXTENDED**

At this time being 10:30 P.M., on motion by C. Wright, seconded by C. Warden and approved by Council, to extend the meeting another 10 minutes and to continue hearing new items.

**Action:** On motion by C. Wright, seconded by C. Warden and approved unanimously by show of hands, to adopt:

**Resolution No. 8988** authorizing the cancellation of the sealed bids advertisement for the City Hall/Police Facility Retrofit, City Contract No. 415.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Ordinance amending Chapter 22, Section 4 of Encroachment Permit Ordinance.**

Public Works Director Curtis stated this amendment would allow the issuance of a stop work orders. He requested a penalty fee be established by a Resolution in the future.

**Action:** On motion by C. Rianda, seconded by C. Warden and approved unanimously by show of hands, to introduce:

Ordinance amending section 22-4 of the Belmont City Code, Streets and Highways, Article 1 Encroachments. (2<sup>nd</sup> reading and adoption scheduled for 5/22/01)

### **Discussion and direction regarding Schedule of Special City Events. (Commission dinner, Holiday party, City picnic).**

Council discussion ensued.

**Action:** On motion by C. Rianda, seconded by C. Warden and approved unanimously by show of hands to approve holding the Commission dinner in early spring before reappointments, and to present Resolutions of Appreciation for milestone years 5/10/15 to the Commissioners; and for the Holiday Party: Commissioners invited, recognition of Councilmembers for length of service.

## **MATTERS OF COUNCIL INTEREST/CLARIFICATION**

### **Discussion and direction regarding Slope Density on unsubdivided lots City-Wide. (Hahn)**

C.Hahn asked the City Council if they would like to implement HRO Slope Density standards Citywide.

C. Wright thought they were looking at the zoning issues piecemeal. He would rather have a more integrative process.

C. Cook was concerned about how this would fit into the workplan for staff.

Community Development Director stated that between the Planning Commission and the City Council they were currently working on approximately half a dozen zoning amendments.

C. Wright stated he would prefer to consider zoning amendments in a more integrative process.

Council decided 4/1 (Wright, No) to consider this item. Community Development Director Ewing tentatively scheduled this to go before the Planning Commission in August.

**ADJOURNMENT** at this time being 10:50 P.M., this meeting was adjourned.

Sheila Harrington

Deputy City Clerk

Meeting tape recorded and televised

Tape no. 495